



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Französische Studien. Herausgegeben von G. KÖRTING und E. KOSCHWITZ.
III Band, 3 Heft. Heilbronn: Henninger.

Die Wortstellung in der altfranzösischen Dichtung "Aucassin et Nicolette,"
von Julius Schlickum.

Prof. Suchier's edition of the Aucassin et Nicolette text, Paderborn, 1881, is taken for this special study, and in the arrangement of the material for it the reader will find much that reminds him of Morf's paper, *Die Wortstellung im altfranzösischen Rolandsliede*, Roman. Studien, Band III, S. 199-294. A short review of the Suchier edition of A. and N. was given in this Journal, Vol. II, pp. 234-36, in which mention was made of the great importance of this work, both for the study of the morphology and the syntax of Old French, and especially for the latter, as its peculiar form—the *Chantefable*, a mixture of prose and poetry—enables us to examine these two species of sentence as given by one and the same author. This advantage is manifest from the outset where we find differences between the poetic and prose construction, and where the former frequently prefers a certain set form varying from the normal one simply to produce by it some psychological or rhetorical effect. Metre and assonance come in here also as important elements to cause the poet to change the position of his words. This is seen particularly in Old French, where, in the relation of object to verb, the strictest rules of syntax are overthrown, while in the modern language this relation is subject to fixed and rigid law for both poetry and prose.

If we take the simplest phrase-elements—subject, verb, object—whose relations to one another are treated by the author in the various kinds of sentence—declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory—we find deviations of usage from certain other models of the Old French literature that are at once striking and instructive, and which, when compared with the canons of modern syntax, show strong tendencies to a development of the present inflexible system. For instance, though there is still a certain freedom with reference to the order of subject and object, yet the predominant tendency is found to be in the direction of the rigid law of the modern language where the subject is required to precede the verb. The writer finds 312 sentences of this kind to only 70 with other positions, thus showing how this expression of the logical sequence of ideas had gained the upper hand in the early period of the language. Inversion is not arbitrary, as Diez and Mätzner have maintained, but subject to fixed laws that scarcely know exception. These results compared with compositions of a century earlier, *e. g.* the *Chanson de Roland* at the end of the XI century, present a striking contrast, in that the latter gives us numerous exceptions to its rule of inversion. Here, with *verba dicendi*, inversion of the subject was regular, and this is also found to be the case for the most part in the poetic

language of Aucassin et Nicolette, but yet was not absolutely necessary, as is shown by such examples as 2, 18 *ses pere et se mere li disoient*.

It is worthy of notice that the modern French construction—predicate adjective at the beginning of the phrase followed by inversion of the subject, *e. g. grand est l'homme qui se vaint lui-meme*—is not found at all in the prose part of A. and N. In the example from 11, 27 *Garis fu li pelerins*, the inversion is conditioned by the assonance, and the writer should have taken advantage of it to state whether this species of poetic construction for the XIII century French was transferred later to prose composition, and, if so, under what conditions the change was made. He says nothing whatever about it. In intercalated phrases we have inversion without a single exception just as in the modern language, but here again it is only the prose that furnishes us with examples.

The author very wisely rejects (p. 7) the favorite 'ellipsis theory' for optative phrases, in accordance with which they are made to depend on a verb of wishing understood. He finds two cases of this construction with *que* (4, 4 *que la tere soit maleoite ! 24, 61 que benois soies tu !*) which agrees perfectly with the modern form, but which seems to have been wholly unknown to the Chanson de Roland, according to Morf's study. In adverbial sentences, inversion seems to have been purposely avoided, since out of 300 examples cited not a single case of it comes up. In this respect the A. and N. forms a striking contrast with the earliest compositions of Old French (Passion du Christ, etc.) where the Latin exercised a strong influence on the form of literary expression.

So far as the object is concerned, both Old and Modern French agree in general in putting it after the verb, and A. and N. offers us only eighteen cases of variation from this rule. Here again we note a great advance towards the present strict law of position, while in the Chanson de Roland only 58 per cent. of the sentences make the object follow the verb. At the end of the XI century, then, object + verb was the regular construction; in the beginning of the XIII century, verb + object was the approved syntactical arrangement. For the construction of the pronoun A. and N. knows only strict rule of pre-position for the atonics and post-position for the tonics, while there is no trace to be found of the modern *me le* (*il me le donna*), *te le* for *le me*, etc., the natural order of direct + indirect object which was common to the whole of the Old French period.

In the treatment of its adjectives A. and N. holds an interesting position in that the construction, adjective + noun, is by far the predominant one, the ratio being (adjective + noun) 12 : 1 (noun + adjective). This exceptional tendency of our poem is attributed to German influence, though the writer ventures to suggest that we cannot be sure of it till the position of the attributive adjective in Low Latin is better determined.

In summing up the value of this contribution to Old French syntax it must be said that it contains all the constructions of a very limited work (42 octavo pages in all), that the subject-matter is presented in a clear, intelligible, systematic way, though not original with the author. One feels constantly, however, the lack of comparison throughout the whole of it. The results of the investigation show that this composition holds a sort of middle place in syntax between the XI century documents and the modern language, and this fact should have been sharply stated and illustrated by abundant examples drawn from both sources. Corresponding phrase-building in the cognate languages

should also have been drawn upon largely to show the general character of many of the sentence-forms ; but this is not done, nor is there scarcely even a reference to the Latin construction, which, in certain cases, would have illustrated the force of a given order of words much more clearly than any possible explanation according to general principles. On the whole, this little pamphlet may be used with advantage by those studying the text for the first time, and it forms an important factor in the line of special syntactical studies which must be the basis for any future general syntax of Old French.

4 Heft.

In Vol. III, p. 434 sqq., the editor of this Journal, in his "Studies in Pindaric Syntax," designates the four principal forms of the Conditional Sentence which the Greek holds sharply apart as 'logical,' 'anticipatory,' 'ideal,' and 'unreal.' The second of these, the 'anticipatory'—ἐάν τι ἔχωμεν, δώσομεν—was turned over by the Latin from the region of objective possibility into that of reality ('logical') and both represented by the indicative, thus reducing the number of its leading conditional forms to three. For the two remaining Greek species, the 'ideal' and the 'unreal,' the Latin kept its own peculiar mode of treatment with a clear distinction of mood and tense in each. In the 'ideal' type where the Greek has εἰ with the optative in the protasis, and optative with ἄν in the apodosis, the Latin uses the subjunctive (pres. or perf.) in both clauses (*Haec si tecum patria loquatur nonne impetrare debeat* ; *Si me suspendam, meam operam luserim*), while in the 'unreal' condition—the hypothesis contrary to fact—it employs a past tense of the subjunctive to express the double point of view of present and past time. For the domain of the present the imperf. stands in both clauses (*sapientia non expeteretur, si nihil efficeret* = εἰ τι εἶχον, ἐδίδουν ἄν); for that of the past, the pluperfect (*si voluisset, dimicasset* = εἰ τι ἔσχον, ἔδωκα ἄν).

In the representation of these phases of the 'unreal' condition, Modern French syntax presents a striking contrast with the Latin by the use of the indicative imperf. in the protasis and the imperfect future (conditional) in the apodosis (*je le ferais encore, si j'avais à le faire*—Corneille) for present time, and the pluperfect indicative and pluperfect future (*si . . . les législateurs avaient établi la cession des biens, on ne serait pas tombé dans tant de séditions*) for past time. This cutting loose from the traditions of the mother language and nearer approach to the Greek type of construction is most striking, and it is the chief merit of the paper before us—*Historische Entwicklung der syntaktischen Verhältnisse der Bedingungssätze im Altfranzösischen*, von Joseph Klapperich—to have followed up the traces of the Latin sentence construction in French, and to have shown, as might *à priori* have been expected, that this passage from the domain of subjective to that of objective representation of thought was not a process that took place suddenly.

Just as we saw a reduction in the number of conditional forms in passing from the Greek to the Latin, so the author of this treatise discovers that from the very earliest period of the French the 'anticipatory' had been merged into the 'logical' condition, which always takes the indicative, while the type of subjective possibility—the 'ideal' condition—has been pushed forward and, for the most part, identified with the 'unreal' condition. This leaves us, then,

only two leading species of conditional phrase for the modern language, viz. the 'logical' and the 'unreal,' instead of the three of the mother idiom. Of these two main sets of the hypothetical sentence, it is the first which is characterized by the almost exclusive use of the indicative present and future in the subordinate and principal members, respectively, of the phrase. The substitution of the future for the present in the protasis is very unusual, though we do find sporadic traces of it as far down as the XVI century, and it is doubtless to the Low Latin that we must look for the model, according to which, with time, the rigid Modern French rule was built up of excluding the future from the conditional member of a hypothetical clause. Draeger, in his *Hist. Syntax*, II, p. 286-8, notes the use of the present for the future in this case as a common phenomenon in the Folks Latin, and the usage has simply been confirmed by a further development of the modern syntax. The French here differs very materially from other members of the Romance group of languages which admit the future as the legitimate type of the protasis. *E. g.* Ital. Dante, *Inf.* I 121, *alle qua' poi se tu vorrai salire, anima fia a ciò di me più degna.* Port. Camões *Os Lusíadas*, IV 18, *Rei tendes tal, que se o valor tiverdes Igual ao Rei, que agora alevantastes, Desbaratareis tudo o que quizer des.* The same construction prevails in Spanish, while the Provençal, on the other hand, agrees with the French.

Very few examples are found by the writer where, according to the Latin arrangement (*in insidiis hic ero, si quid deficias*), the subjunctive is used in the protasis of an 'ideal' condition, with the future in the apodosis.

For the 'unreal' condition the Old French used the imperfect subjunctive in both clauses, corresponding exactly to the Latin usage. In the earliest period of the language, however, this imperfect frequently represents the Latin pluperfect in meaning, from which it had taken its form, and as this construction prevails throughout the whole of the Old French period, it cannot be reckoned as a rare phenomenon as Mätzner does in his *Syntax*, I, p. 97. In fact its use is so common that it has usurped the legitimate field of the pluperfect subjunctive in both clauses of a conditional sentence, so that this latter does not appear at all in this capacity in the oldest texts. The oldest documents likewise know nothing of the Modern French order, pluperfect in the protasis + imperfect future (conditional) in the apodosis, of which the earliest examples cited belong to the Wace's *Roman de Rou* of the second half of the XII century. For a long time, however, the pluperfect subjunctive held exclusive sway in the protasis, when the condition bore upon past time, and it was not till a comparatively recent period that it split up into the Modern French type of indicative and subjunctive pluperfect in the subordinate clause. The subjunctive construction in such cases is now dying out, according to K.'s investigation, who explains its continuance in use so long from the fact that the compound tense was adopted here at an epoch when the conditional phrase that bore upon the present or future had already begun to go over to the Modern French construction. This I hold to be, however, only a specious cause for its long life. The chief reason for it lies in the conservative tendencies of the language itself, a desire to hold fast to the old models of expression which we see strongly manifested in the exclusive use of the subjunctive element up to within a recent period of the language.

For the domain of the present and future, where the Old French characteristic construction is the imperfect subjunctive in both clauses, the modern form of

imperfect indicative in the protasis and imperfect future (conditional) in the apodosis appears at an early date. The first examples cited belong to the *Comput* of Philippe de Thaon—beginning of the XII century—and yet there are cases of a manifest tendency to it as far back as the Chanson de Roland (XI century), where in v. 1804, *Se veissum Rollant, ainz qu'il fust morz, Ensembl' od lui i durriums granz colps*, the only variation from the modern type consists in the use of the imperfect subjunctive in place of the imperfect indicative in the protasis. This and other examples of similar construction prove beyond doubt that the emancipation from the Latin mould took place originally in the apodosis. This construction cited from the Chanson de Roland has died out in French, but it still lives in the other Romance languages, e. g. Ital. *s'egli venisse, lo troverebbe*; Spanish, *si yo le viese, se lo daría*. This is, then, the bridge by which we have passed from the Old French subjunctive in both clauses to the modern imperfect indicative + the future. From the beginning of the XII century this construction is constantly gaining ground, until towards the end of the same when it becomes the predominant type of hypothetical phrase for present and future time.

The modern construction with imperfect indicative in both clauses when the condition bears upon past time, is unknown in the earlier documents. Here, too, the principal clause became the transition link by which the present typical form was developed out of the old one.

The original Old French subjunctive-protasis lived on up into the XVI century, when it finally became folks style; and just as the subjunctive kept its place in the protasis longer than in the apodosis in the pure condition, so in hypothetical constructions with the comparative particles *comme* and *que*, the principal clause was the first to yield to the new conception of time relation and pass from the subjunctive to the indicative type.

In conditional relative phrases the writer finds the same construction prevailing as in the conditional with *si*, except that they do not entirely exclude the future from the subordinate clause.

Several other less important kinds of condition are examined in this interesting paper, the principal one of which is the hypothetical subordinate phrase used as a formula of conjuration. Diez' ellipsis theory is here stuck to by the writer in opposition to Bischoff, who, in his *Conjunctiv bei Crestien de Troies*, regards it as a mixture of two optative constructions. The Roman de Rou contains the first use of *se* in these formulas, e. g. II 670 *Gentils ber, dist li reis, Se Deus me beneie, Tuz sui prez*.

In the sequence of two conditional subordinate clauses the omission of *se* in the second member is the common rule in Old French, and it was not till in the XV century that the modern law of substitution of *que* for *se* in this case became general; however, we do find occasional examples of it as far back as the middle of the XII century, e. g. Rou III 8943, *Et se Deus le velt consentir E que a lui vienge a plaisir, Bien le feron d'ore en avant*.

On the whole, I think this treatise, of sixty-five pages, altogether the most comprehensive and the best that has yet appeared for this department of syntax. The writer has evident control of his material for the Old French and gives us frequent references to the Latin, but as is usual with all such works very little account is taken of parallel or identical phenomena in the cognate languages. This lack is especially felt for certain phases of construction which at one

time existed in the French in common with the other Romance idioms, and which have disappeared from the former for some local or other reason, but still live as legitimate types in the latter. Notwithstanding these minor drawbacks, however, we have in this work the greatest step ever taken as yet towards building up a general Old French syntax.

A. M. E.

Beowulf: an Anglo-Saxon Poem, and The Fight at Finnsburg. Translated by JAMES M. GARNETT. With facsimile of the Unique Manuscript in the British Museum, Cotton. Vitellius A XV. Boston: Ginn, Heath & Co. 1882.

Wülcker's remark in *Anglia* (Anzeiger zu Band IV): Eine vollständige Übertragung des Beowulf ist meines Wissens in Amerika nicht erschienen, is now no longer true; for here is not only a complete translation, but a good one, the best that has yet appeared indeed for perplexed students who hold text in one hand and translation in the other for purposes of comparison. The translation is based on Grein's separate text (1867), with notes that add renderings of the variations in the text of Heyne's fourth ed. (1879). The translator has used Grein's and Heyne's Glossaries, and retains Grein's divisions of the poem, adding headings that recall the contents of each division. He has studiously abstained from consulting the existing English translations. A Preface, explanatory of the growth of the translation as originally a piece of class-work intended to aid his post-graduate students; an Introduction setting forth (1) the contents of the poem, (2) its date, (3) the scene, (4) the names of the tribes represented in the poem, (5) the life of the time, (6) the composition and (7) metre, (8) a bibliography; a glossary of proper names, and a list of Old English words used in the translation, are added by the translator.

The Bibliography is an exceedingly valuable feature and far exceeds Wülcker's and Botkine's in completeness. That it is not exhaustive may be seen from the following list of miscellaneous omissions, added here for the benefit of other collectors of Beowulf literature: Outzen's Ueber das A. S. Beowulf (Kieler Blätter, 1816); Sweet, Englische Studien, II 313; Ettmüller's Geschichte der deutschen Literatur, mit eingeschlossen der Angelsächsischen; Ebeling's A. S. Lesebuch (Leipzig, 1847); Thorpe's Rask (1879); Arend's Proeve eener Geschiedenis der dichtkunst en fraaije letteren onder der Angelsaksen (Amsterdam, 1842); Skeat's Guest's English Rhythms; Der Genetiv im Beowulf, von Dr. E. Nader (1882); Die Synonyma im Beowulfliede, mit Rücksicht auf Composition und Poetik des Gedichtes, von K. Schemann (1882?); W. Taylor's Historic Survey of German Poetry, interspersed with various Translations, 3 vols. (London, 1830); Sievers's Kleine Bemerkungen und Fragen zum Beowulf, in Paul und Braune's Beiträge, IX, pp. 135-44; Longfellow's Poets and Poetry of Europe (new ed. 1871);¹ Wright's Biographia Britannica Literaria, and Celt, Roman, and Saxon (for references to armor, etc.); Kemble's Saxons in England (for discussion of political institutions, the germs

¹ The reviewer is indebted to Mr. Bright, Fellow of the Johns Hopkins University, for the three last notes. Several of the essays indicated have appeared since Dr. Garnett's translation.